

Remarks

The Amendments to the Claims

To advance prosecution, the claims have been amended as suggested on page 7, last paragraph of the Final Office Action. These amendments were not previously made because Applicants believed the arguments in the last response were sufficient to overcome the rejections. The amendments do not add new matter.

The Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Final Office Action asserts that the claim was amended to recite “wherein the mucosal secretion is obtained from.” The amendment to claim 14 made in the last response read as follows:

14. (currently amended) The method of claim 13 wherein the mucosal secretion is obtained from a ~~mucosa selected from the group consisting of gut mucosa, vaginal mucosa, oral mucosa, and nasal mucosa.~~

The recitation “gut mucosa” was not deleted from the claim. Thus, claim 14 as amended now reads “The method of claim 13 wherein the mucosal secretion is obtained from a gut mucosa.” The amended claim is clear and definite.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action makes five rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

- claims 1, 3, 5-13, 14, 16-19, 21-25, 27, 28, and 36-43 stand rejected over Shionoya, U.S. Patent 4,414,201 (“Shionoya”) in view of O’Hagan *et al.*, *Vaccine* 17, 2229-36, 1999 (“O’Hagan”);
- claims 4 and 34 stand rejected over Shionoya in view of Carrano *et al.*, U.S. Patent 5,962,428 (“Carrano”);
- claim 15 stands rejected over Shionoya in view of Gough and Platt, U.S. Patent 4,470,967 (“Gough”);
- claims 20 and 31 stand rejected over Shionoya in view of Hodges *et al.*, U.S. Patent 5,445,818 (“Hodges”); and
- claim 30 stands rejected over Shionoya in view of Friedman *et al.*, U.S. Patent 5,744,155 (“Friedman”).

Claims 27, 28, and 34 are canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 3-14, 16-25, 30, 31, and 36-43.

The Final Office Action acknowledges that “[t]he utilization of the plant lectins ML-I, ML-II, ML-III, and UEA as mucosal adjuvants appears to be novel and unobvious.” Page 7, last paragraph.¹ The Final Office Action also acknowledges that “immunization methods involving the mucosal administration of these adjuvants [ML-I, ML-II, ML-III, and UEA-I] in conjunction with a suitable immunogen would be acceptable.” To advance prosecution, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite this subject matter.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

¹ In view of this acknowledgment, the rejection of claim 4 appears to be in error. Claim 4 recites that the plant lectin is ML-I.

Please continue to address all correspondence in this application to Rebecca M. Hale,
Chiron Corporation, 4560 Horton Street, Emeryville, CA 94608-2916.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 20, 2004

By: Lisa M. Hemmendinger
Lisa M. Hemmendinger
Registration No. 42,653

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
1001 G Street, N.W., Eleventh Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
(202) 824-3000